



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No.

Carlos Nieves, Esq.  
J. M. Huber Corporation  
333 Thornall Street  
Edison NJ 08837-2220

**COPY MAILED**

MAY 04 2009

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:	
Sung-Tsuen Liu	:	
Application No. 10/717,310	:	
Filed: November 19, 2003	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Attorney Docket No. 02-215	:	UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(B)
Title: STABILIZED VATERITE	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed November 12, 2008, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), to revive the above-identified application.

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply within the meaning of 37 C.F.R. § 1.113 in a timely manner to the final Office action mailed November 9, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) was received on December 3, 2007, and a Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination (RCE) was mailed on January 9, 2008, indicating that the RCE had not been accompanied by a submission, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. The notice did not extend the period for response that was set by the final Office action. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) were obtained, and no response was received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on February 10, 2008. A notice of abandonment was mailed on July 14, 2008.

A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(m);
- (3) A statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional, and;
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was unintentional. Since the statement contained in this petition varies from the language required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b)(3), the statement contained in this petition is being construed as the statement required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b)(3) and Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation of the statement contained in this petition.

With this petition, Petitioner has submitted the petition fee, an amendment, and a statement that is being construed as the proper statement of unintentional delay.

The first three requirements of Rule 1.137(b) have been met. The fourth requirement of Rule 1.137(b) is not applicable, as a terminal disclaimer is not required.<sup>1</sup>

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will notify the Examiner of this decision, so that the submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 - the amendment received on November 12, 2008 - can be processed.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the present decision to ensure that the revival has been acknowledged by the Technology Center in response to this

---

<sup>1</sup> See Rule 1.137(d).

decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to any failure of that change in status should be directed to the Technology Center where that change of status must be effected - the Office of Petitions cannot effectuate a change of status.

Telephone inquiries regarding *this decision* should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225.<sup>2</sup> All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

It is noted that the address listed on the petition differs from the address of record. The application file does not indicate a change of correspondence address has been filed in this case, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. If Petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the change of correspondence address must be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision will be mailed to Petitioner. However, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary. Petitioner will not receive future correspondence related to this application unless Change of Correspondence Address, Patent Form (PTO/SB/122) is submitted for the above-identified application. For Petitioner's convenience, a blank Change of Correspondence Address, Patent Form (PTO/SB/122), may be found at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/forms/sb0122.pdf>.

/Paul Shanoski/  
Paul Shanoski  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

cc: William S. Parks  
Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP  
1715 Aaron Brenner Drive  
Memphis, TN 38120-4367

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any further action(s) of Petitioner.